

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/148138>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

The changing psychological type profile and psychological temperament
of Church of England clergy

Leslie J. Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

Andrew Village

York St John University, UK

David Voas

University College London, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J. Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

As part of the Church Growth Research Programme in 2013 Voas and Watt collected the psychological profiles of 1,164 clergymen and 307 clergywomen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry, using the Francis Psychological Type Scales. This paper sets these data alongside the profile of 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen published in 2007. This comparison suggests a significant movement among both clergymen and clergywomen away from intuition and away from perceiving. This results in a significant increase in the SJ temperament among Anglican clergy (from 31% to 39% among clergymen and from 29% to 40% among clergywomen), suggesting a movement toward a more conserving and less adventurous approach to ministry. At the same time the gap has narrowed in the preference between thinking and feeling among clergymen and clergywomen, enhancing the feminine profile of clergymen and reducing the feminine profile of clergywomen.

Keywords: clergy studies, Church of England, psychological type, psychological temperament, Francis Psychological Type Scales

Introduction

Psychological type theory and psychological temperament theory have an established and growing place in the science of clergy studies since at least the 1980s. Psychological type theory was brought to the attention of the science of clergy studies by surveys like those reported by Greenfield (1969) among persisting and non-persisting Jewish clergymen, by Harbough (1984), and Holsworth (1984) among seminarians, and by Cabral (1984) and Bigelow, Fitzferald, Busk, Girault, and Avis (1988) among religious sisters. Findings from a number of clergy studies were collated and analysed by Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) in their *Atlas of Type Tables*. Psychological temperament theory was brought to the attention of the science of clergy studies by Oswald and Kroeger (1988) in their book, *Personality Type and Religious Leadership*.

Psychological type theory

Psychological type theory has its roots in the observations and documentation of human behaviour by Jung (1971) and in the developments shaped by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). The basic building blocks of psychological type theory distinguish between two orientations (extraversion and introversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). Drawing on data provided by 191 Anglican clergymen serving in the Church in Wales, Francis and Payne (2002) demonstrated how these building blocks of psychological type theory can account for ways in which clergy may prefer to shape and focus their ministry style. For example, introverted and extraverted clergy emphasise different aspects of public engagement in ministry. Drawing on data provided by 1,703 Anglican clergy serving in the Church of England, Voas and Watt (2014) demonstrated that extraverted clergy were more

likely than introverted clergy to be leading growing churches.

The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from; energy can be gathered either from the outside world or from the inner world. Clergy who prefer extraversion (E) are orientated toward the outside world; they are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They prefer to act in a situation rather than to reflect on it. They may vocalise a problem or an idea, rather than thinking it through privately. They tend to focus their attention upon what is happening outside themselves. They are usually open individuals, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many people around them. In contrast, clergy who prefer introversion (I) are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They may feel drained by events and people around them. They prefer to reflect on a situation rather than to act in it. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention upon what is happening in their inner life. They may appear reserved and detached as they are difficult to get to know.

The perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people receive and process information; this can be done through use of the senses or through use of intuition. Clergy who prefer sensing (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical and tend to be down-to-earth and matter-of-fact. They may feel that particular details are more significant than general patterns. They are frequently fond of the traditional and conventional. They may be conservative and tend to prefer what is known and well-established. In contrast, clergy who prefer intuition (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind; indirect associations and concepts impact their perceptions. They focus on the overall picture,

rather than specific facts and data. They follow their inspirations enthusiastically, but not always realistically. They can appear to be up in the air and may be seen as idealistic dreamers. They often aspire to bring innovative change to established conventions.

The judging functions are concerned with the way in which people make decisions and judgements; this can be done through use of objective impersonal logic or subjective interpersonal values. Clergy who prefer thinking (T) make judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. They are often good at making difficult decisions as they are able to analyse problems in order to reach an unbiased and reasonable solution. They are frequently referred to as 'tough-minded'. They may consider it to be more important to be honest and correct than to be tactful, when working with others. In contrast, clergy who prefer feeling (F) make judgements based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles. They may be thought of as 'people-persons', as they are able to take into account other people's feelings and values in decision-making and problem-solving, ensuring they reach a solution that satisfies everyone. They are often thought of as 'warm-hearted'. They may find it difficult to criticise others, even when it is necessary. They find it easy to empathise with other people and tend to be trusting and encouraging of others.

The attitudes towards the outside world are concerning with the way in which people respond to the world around them, either by imposing structure and order on that world or remaining open and adaptable to the world around them. Clergy who prefer judging (J) have a planned, orderly approach to life. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and may make use of lists,

timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They may find it difficult to deal with unexpected disruptions of their plans. Likewise, they are inclined to be resistant to changes to established methods. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. In contrast, clergy who prefer perceiving (P) have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. They may find plans and schedules restrictive and tend to be easy going about issues such as punctuality, deadlines, and tidiness. Indeed, they may consider last minute pressure to be a necessary motivation in order to complete projects. They are often good at dealing with the unexpected. Indeed, they may welcome change and variety as routine bores them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

Temperament theory

Drawing on the basic building blocks of psychological type theory, Keirsey and Bates (1978) distinguished between four temperaments characterised as SJ, SP, NT, and NF, and to each of these temperaments they ascribe a distinctive name rooted in classic mythology. The Epimethean Temperament characterises the SJ profile, people who long to be dutiful and exist primarily to be useful to the social units to which they belong. The Dionysian Temperament characterises the SP profile, people who want to be engaged, involved, and doing something new. The Promethean Temperament characterises the NT profile, people who want to understand, explain, shape and predict realities, and who prize their personal competence. The Apollonian Temperament characterises the NF profile, people who quest for authenticity and for self-actualisation, who are idealistic and who have great capacity for empathic listening. Oswald and Kroeger (1988) built on Keirsey and Bates' (1978) characterisation of the four temperaments to create profiles of how these four temperaments shape four very different styles of religious leadership.

The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) is styled 'the conserving, serving pastor'. SJ

clergy tend to be the most traditional of all clergy temperaments, bringing stability and continuity in whatever situation they are called to serve. They proclaim a single and straightforward faith, committed to down-to-earth rules for the Christian life. They serve as protectors and conservers of the traditions inherited from the past. If change is to take place, it emerges by evolution, not revolution. They excel at building community, fostering a sense of loyalty and belonging. They bring order and stability to their congregations, creating plans, developing procedures and formulating policies; and they are keen that these procedures should be followed. They can be trusted for their reliability, punctuality and efficiency. They are effective pastors, showing particular concern for the young, the elderly, and the weak. They are realists who offer practical and down-to-earth solutions to pastoral problems.

The Dionysian Temperament (SP) is styled ‘the action-oriented pastor’. SP clergy tend to be the most fun loving of all clergy temperaments, possessing a compulsive need to be engaged in activity. They have little need for or interest in the abstract, the theoretical, and the non-practical aspects of theology and church life. They are flexible and spontaneous people who welcome the unplanned and unpredictable aspects of church life. They can bring the church to life with activities for everyone from cradle to grave. They have a flare for grasping the moment. They are entertainers and performers at heart. They are at their best in a crisis and are good at handling conflict resolution. They are fun loving and enjoy working with children and young people. They are better at starting new initiatives than at seeing things through. SP clergy may be particularly attracted to charismatic worship, responding to the leading of the Holy Spirit, welcoming a free-flowing form that allows for impromptu testimonials, speaking in tongues, and spontaneous singing.

The Promethean Temperament (NT) is styled ‘the intellectual, competence-seeking pastor’. NT clergy are the most academically and intellectually grounded of all clergy temperaments, motivated by the search for meaning for truth and for possibilities. They are

visionaries who need to excel in all they do, and they tend to push their congregations to excel as well. They enjoy the academic study and analysis of the faith, and may try to run their church as an extension of the seminary. They make great teachers, preachers, and advocates for social justice. They look for underlying principles rather than basic applications from their study of scripture. They see the value of opposing views and strive to allow alternative visions to be heard. They are more concerned with finding truth than with engineering harmony and compromise. NT clergy need to be challenged in their ministry and to be able to move from one challenge to the next.

The Apollonian Temperament (NF) is styled ‘the authenticity-seeking, relationship-oriented pastor’. NF clergy tend to be the most idealistic and romantic of all clergy temperaments, attracted to helping roles that deal with human suffering. They want to meet the needs of others and to find personal affirmation in so doing. They can be articulate and inspiring communicators, committed to influencing others by touching their hearts. They have good empathic capacity, interpersonal skills, and pastoral counselling techniques. They find themselves listening to other people’s problems in the most unlikely contexts, and really caring about them. NF clergy tend to be high on inspiration, but lower on the practical down-to-earth aspects of ministry. They are able to draw the best out of people and work well as the catalyst or facilitator in the congregation as long as others are on hand to work with and to implement their vision. They are at their best when leading in people-related projects, such as starting a project for the elderly or for youth. They are most comfortable in unstructured meetings where they are good at facilitating group decision-making processes.

Church of England clergy

The first major study of the psychological type profile of Church of England clergy was published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). Using the 126-item Form G (Anglicised) of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, they compiled data from 626

clergymen and 237 clergywomen serving in the Church of England. The data were collected over a number of years prior to 2005 mainly in the context of a wide range of personal and professional development programmes, including courses run for curates in their early years of ministry, for mid-ministry development, and for pre-retirement preparation. Although not a representative sample of Anglican clergy, the data drew together clergy from a wide range of backgrounds and experiences. Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) published the data for clergymen and clergywomen separately in light of the sex differences routinely reported within the psychological type literature (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Among the 626 clergymen, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) reported preferences for introversion (57%) over extraversion (43%), for intuition (62%) over sensing (38%), for feeling (54%) over thinking (47%) and for judging (68%) over perceiving (32%). In terms of the four temperaments, 35% reported the Apollonian NF temperament, 31% the Epimethean SJ temperament, 27% the Promethean NT temperament, and 7% the Dionysian SP temperament. When these 626 clergymen were compared with the UK population norms published for men by Kendall (1998) three important differences emerged. The first difference concerned the perceiving process. While 62% of clergymen preferred intuition, within the general population just 27% of men preferred intuition. The implication of this difference is that men may see clergy as living in a somewhat different world from themselves, as unrealistic and speculative dreamers with their heads in the air and their feet not touching the ground. The second difference concerned the judging process. While 54% of clergymen preferred feeling, just 35% of men within the general population preferred feeling. In the general population 70% of women prefer feeling compared with 35% of men, giving the feeling function a feminine connotation. The implication of this difference is that men may see clergymen as functioning in a feminine way and not facing up to conflict and tough decisions in a characteristically masculine manner. The third difference concerned the

attitude toward the outside world. While 68% of clergymen preferred judging, the proportion fell to 55% of men within the general population. The implications of this difference is that men may see clergymen as particularly inflexible and rigid in their approach to the world.

Among the 237 clergywomen, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) reported preferences for introversion (54%) over extraversion (46%), for intuition (65%) over sensing (35%), for feeling (74%) over thinking (26%), and for judging (65%) over perceiving (35%). In terms of the four temperaments, 50% reported the Apollonian NF temperament, 29% the Epimethean SJ temperament, 15% the Promethean NT temperament, and 6% the Dionysian SP temperament. When these 237 clergywomen were compared with the UK population norms published by Kendall (1998) two important differences emerged. The first difference concerned the perceiving process. While 65% of the clergywomen preferred intuition, just 21% of women within the general population preferred intuition. The implication of this difference for women is the same as for men. Women may see clergywomen as living in a somewhat different world from themselves, perhaps being too heavenly minded to be of much earthly good. The second difference concerned the orientations. While 54% of clergywomen preferred introversion, the proportion was significantly smaller among women within the general population at 43%.

Within the scientific community replication provides an important way to check whether an initial set of findings can be trusted to be more generally representative. With that in mind, Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010) compiled data from a second sample of 622 clergymen, who completed the 126-item Form G (Anglicised) of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), generally in the context of personal and professional development programmes. The findings from the two studies of clergymen were highly similar. In the replication study, the clergymen reported preferences for introversion (64%) over extraversion (36%), for intuition (67%) over sensing (33%), for feeling (56%)

over thinking (44%), and for judging (73%) over perceiving (27%). In terms of the four temperaments, 39% reported the Apollonian NF temperament, 28% the Promethean NT temperament, 27% the Epimethean SJ temperament, and 6% the Dionysian SP temperament.

At the same time, Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011) compiled data from a second sample of 83% clergywomen who also completed the 126-item Form G of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1988), generally in the context of personal and professional development programmes. The figures from the two studies of clergywomen were highly similar. In the replication study, the clergywomen reported preferences for introversion (63%) over extraversion (37%), for intuition (60%) over sensing (40%), for feeling (76%) over thinking (24%), and for judging (55%) over perceiving (45%). In terms of the four temperaments, 49% reported the Apollonian NF temperament, 32% the Epimethean SJ temperament, 23% the Promethean NT temperament, and 7% the Dionysian SP temperament.

Research question

The Church Growth Research Programme reported by Voas and Watt (2014) provided a unique opportunity to generate data from a broad sample of Church of England clergy who held parochial posts with responsibility for local church congregations. The online survey included the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). From an effective sample of 3,735, there were 1,703 responses of which 1,458 were complete (a response rate of 39%). The aim of the present study is to revisit this database and to compare the profiles generated from these samples of clergymen and clergywomen with the profiles published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). If that earlier study can be trusted as giving a reliable profile of clergymen and clergywomen generated during the 1990s and early 2000s, comparison with these new data would draw attention to changes over time.

Method

Procedure

The data used in this study came from a large online survey administered between April and July 2013 as part of the Church of England's Church Growth Research Programme. Invitations to participate in the survey were sent by email to clergy (mostly with incumbent status) within a large sample of parishes. More detail regarding the sample and overall study can be found in Voas and Watt (2014).

Participants

The present analysis is based on the 1,164 clergymen and 307 clergywomen who provided full data on the measure of psychological type, who completed the measure of church orientation, who were engaged in stipendiary ministry, and who were not over the age of seventy. The ratio between male and female participants is very close to the situation within the Church of England as a whole of that time. In the present sample clergywomen comprise 21% of the participants, while clergywomen comprise 22% of total parochial clergy according to Voas and Watt (2014, p. 110).

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005b). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of 10 forced-choice items relating to each of the four components of psychological type: the two orientations (extraversion and introversion), the two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), the two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and the two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check 'the box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristic that reflects the real you, even if other people see you differently'.

Data analysis

Within the scientific literature concerned with analysing and presenting psychological type data, the distinctive type tables provide information about the 16 complete types, about the four dichotomous preferences, about the six sets of pairs and temperaments, about the dominant types, and about the introverted and extraverted Jungian types. Commentary on this table will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question. In the context of type tables the statistical significance of the difference between two groups is established by means of the selection ratio index (*I*), an extension of chi-square (McCaulley, 1985). In tables 1 and 2 the data are displayed for the clergy who participated in the survey in 2013 and these data are compared with the profile published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). Table 3 then presents summary data for clergymen and clergywomen alongside the population norms published by Kendall (1998).

Results

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 1 presents the psychological type profile of the 1,164 clergymen. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (55%) over extraversion (45%), for intuition (55%) over sensing (45%), for feeling (59%) over thinking (41%) and for judging (75%) over perceiving (25%). In terms of the four temperaments 39% reported the Epimethean SJ temperament, 32% the Apollonian NF temperament, 22% the Promethean NT temperament, and 6% the Dionysian SP temperament.

In terms of the dichotomous preferences, three significant emerge between the profile of the clergymen surveyed in 2013 and the earlier profile reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The first difference concerns the perceiving process on which there is a significant increase in preference for sensing from 38% to 45%. The second difference concerns the attitude toward the outside world on which there is a significant increase in preference for judging from 68% to 75%. It is these two shifts that are reflected in

the significant growth of preference for the Epimethean SJ temperament from 31% to 39%. The third difference concerns the judging process on which there is a significant increase in preference for feeling from 54% to 59%. It is this shift that takes clergymen further away from the male population norms where just 35% of men prefer feeling. This shift suggests a further move toward the feminisation of male clergy.

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type profile of the 307 clergywomen. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (60%) over extraversion (40%), for intuition (56%) over sensing (44%), for feeling (63%) over thinking (37%), and for judging (77%) over perceiving (24%). In terms of the four temperaments, 40% reported the Epimethean SJ temperament, 33% the Apollonian NF temperament, 23% the Promethean NT temperament, and 4% the Dionysian SP temperament.

In terms of the dichotomous preferences, three significant differences emerge between the profile of the clergywomen surveyed in 2013 and the earlier profile published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The first difference concerns the perceiving process on which there is a significant increase in preference for sensing from 35% to 44%. The second difference concerns the attitude toward the outside world on which there is a significant increase in preference for judging from 65% to 77%. It is these two shifts that are reflected in the significant growth in preference for the Epimethean SJ temperament from 29% to 40%. The third difference concerns the judging process on which there is a significant reduction in preference for feeling from 74% to 64%, with a consequent increase in preference for thinking from 26% to 36%.

- insert table 3 about here -

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to set the psychological type profiles of 1,164 clergymen and 307 clergywomen serving in the Church of England in 2013 as generated by Voas and Watt (2014) as part of the Church Growth Research Programme alongside the profiles of 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen generated by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) during the 1990s and early 2000s in order to test whether there were discernible significant shifts in psychological type and psychological temperament profiles of Anglican clergymen and clergywomen as the Church of England faces the challenges of the second decade of the twenty-first century.

Two main features emerge from these comparisons. The first feature concerns the way in which among both clergymen and clergywomen there has been a decline in both intuitive types and perceiving types with consequent increases in both sensing types and judging types. These changes in the dichotomous type preferences are reflected in a significant growth in the number of clergy (both male and female) who report the Epimethean SJ preference. This is the clergy temperament that Oswald and Kroeger (1988) style the ‘conserving serving pastor’. These are clergy who are skilled at operating systems and maintaining structures. They are well placed to care for churches during periods of terminal decline and will ensure that the lights are switched off responsibly when the last financial reserves have been drained. The growth of the Epimethean temperament is reflected in fewer clergy reporting the Apollonian NF temperament (those committed to enthusing others with visions of a new future) and fewer clergy reporting the Promethean NT temperament (those committed to the vision of theological formation for a new generation of Christian disciples).

The second feature concerns the way in which among clergymen there has been an increase in the proportion who prefer feeling with a consequent decrease in the proportion who prefer thinking. The matter of theoretical interest here concerns the way in which the feeling function characterises an essentially feminine way of evaluation and decision-making,

while the thinking function characterises an essentially masculine way of evaluation and decision-making. In the 2013 sample, 59% of clergymen prefer feeling which is closer to the population norm for women (70%) than to the population norm for men (35%). This trend supports the theory of the feminisation of the Church of England (for full discussion see Francis, Village, & Voas, in press). At the same time, in the 2013 sample the clergywomen move significantly away from the 74% endorsement for feeling in the earlier study to 63% endorsement. This now brings the profile of clergywomen and clergymen very close together on the judging process, with 63% of clergywomen and 59% of clergymen preferring feeling. Thus, between the two surveys while clergymen have taken a step in the direction of enhanced femininity, clergywomen have taken a step in the direction of enhanced masculinity. Now churches served by clergymen and clergywomen can expect the same overall approach to the judging process. The God of mercy and the desire for peace and harmony reign triumphant over the God of justice and the desire for truth and fairness.

Conclusion

The present study has examined the comparison between the psychological type profile of Church of England clergy generated by Voas and Watt (2014) on data collected in 2013 with the earlier profile published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) and largely confirmed by the two replication studies reported by Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010) and by Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011). The conclusion has been drawn that there are significant changes in the psychological type and psychological temperament profiles of Church of England clergymen and clergywomen over this period of time.

There are inevitable caveats that need to be placed against this conclusion. There are limitations with the design of both studies: the 2013 study was based on an online survey with less than a 40% participation rate and the earlier study was based on an opportunity

sample of clergy engaged in personal and professional development programmes for a decade or so prior to 2005. Yet at present these two studies provide the most reliable and best data available to the Church of England.

Following the findings at face value raises questions of significance for the recruitment policy of the Church of England. Have the observed changes occurred by chance or do they reflect intentional policy decisions? Although the Church of England may not be consciously applying psychological type theory in its recruitment policy, the data provided by the present study suggests that the outcome of the recruitment process may be illuminated by this theoretical framework. Is the Church of England convinced that it should invest more heavily in the Epimethean SJ style of ministry? Is the Church of England convinced that it should endorse an approach to ministry characterised by the feeling approach to decisions and to evaluations? Is the selection process deliberately not accepting men who display strong preferences for thinking, while at the same time privileging more women who display that preference? Addressing such questions could strengthen future policy and strategy.

Now that the Church of England has endorsed the value of psychological type profiling through the work commissioned from Voas and Watt (2014) there might be real value in including this theoretical framework both within ongoing research into the experience of ministry and also within a systematic assessment of those who make initial enquiries about testing vocations for ministry. While the first initiative could monitor the changing profile of those engaged in ordained ministry, the second initiative could alert bishops to any covert bias in the selection process that may discriminate unintentionally against some psychological types. Indeed a Church committed to transparency and to equal opportunity may need to be as alert to psychological discrimination as to racial and ethnic discrimination.

References

- Bigelow, E. D., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E., & Avis, J. (1988). Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: relationships between the MBTI and other measures. *Journal of Psychological Type, 14*, 32-36.
- Cabral, G. (1984). Psychological types in a Catholic convent: applications to community living and congregational data. *Journal of Psychological Type, 8*, 16-22.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology, 11*, 266-284. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2007.17
- Francis, L. J., & Payne, V. J. (2002). The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): Ministry styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 13*, 125-141.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas and V. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions, 2*, 389-397. doi.org/10.3390/rel2030389
- Francis, L. J., Village, A., & Voas, D. (in press). Psychological type theory, femininity and the appeal of Anglo-Catholicism: A study among Anglican clergymen in England.
- Greenfield, M. (1969). Typologies of persisting and non-persisting Jewish clergymen. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 16*, 368-372. doi.org/10.1037/h0027708

Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). The person in ministry: Psychological type and the seminary.

Journal of Psychological Type, 8, 23-32.

Holsworth, T. E. (1984). Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians. *Journal of*

Psychological Type, 8, 33-35.

Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works* (volume 6). London:

Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.

Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA:

Consulting Psychologists Press.

McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for

comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 46-56.

Macdaid, G. P., McCaulley, M. H., & Kainz, R.I. (1986). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Atlas*

of type tables. Gainesville, Florida: Centre for Application of Psychological Type Inc.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the*

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality Type and Religious Leadership*.

Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.

Voas, D., & Watt, L. (2014). *Numerical change in church attendance: National, local and*

individual factors. Report commissioned by the Church of England. Retrieved from

http://www.churchgrowthresearch.org/uk/progress_findings_reports

Table 1

Psychological type profile for clergymen in 2013 compared with profile from Francis et al (2007)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 121 (10.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.05 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 149 (12.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.64*** +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 127 (10.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.20 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 121 (10.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 +++++	E I S N	<i>n</i> = 525 <i>n</i> = 639 <i>n</i> = 528 <i>n</i> = 636	(45.1%) (54.9%) (45.4%) (54.6%)	<i>I</i> = 1.05 <i>I</i> = 0.97 <i>I</i> = 1.18** <i>I</i> = 0.89**				
	+++	+		T F	<i>n</i> = 474 <i>n</i> = 690	(40.7%) (59.3%)	<i>I</i> = 0.88* <i>I</i> = 1.11**				
				J P	<i>n</i> = 875 <i>n</i> = 289	(75.2%) (24.8%)	<i>I</i> = 1.10** <i>I</i> = 0.78**				
ISTP <i>n</i> = 8 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.31** +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 31 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.85 +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 54 (4.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.46*** +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 28 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.46*** ++	Pairs and Temperaments							
				IJ IP EP EJ	<i>n</i> = 518 <i>n</i> = 121 <i>n</i> = 168 <i>n</i> = 357	(44.5%) (10.4%) (14.4%) (30.7%)	<i>I</i> = 1.18** <i>I</i> = 0.55*** <i>I</i> = 1.13 <i>I</i> = 1.01				
				ST SF NF NT	<i>n</i> = 214 <i>n</i> = 314 <i>n</i> = 376 <i>n</i> = 260	(18.4%) (27.0%) (32.3%) (22.3%)	<i>I</i> = 0.93 <i>I</i> = 1.46*** <i>I</i> = 0.92 <i>I</i> = 0.84*				
ESTP <i>n</i> = 10 (0.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 26 (2.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.93 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 94 (8.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.20 +++++ +++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 38 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.28 +++	SJ SP NP NJ	<i>n</i> = 453 <i>n</i> = 75 <i>n</i> = 214 <i>n</i> = 422	(38.9%) (6.4%) (18.4%) (36.3%)	<i>I</i> = 1.25*** <i>I</i> = 0.90 <i>I</i> = 0.75** <i>I</i> = 0.98				
				TJ TP FP FJ	<i>n</i> = 390 <i>n</i> = 84 <i>n</i> = 205 <i>n</i> = 485	(33.5%) (7.2%) (17.6%) (41.7%)	<i>I</i> = 0.95 <i>I</i> = 0.65** <i>I</i> = 0.85 <i>I</i> = 1.27***				
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 75 (6.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 +++++ +	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 108 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.35 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 101 (8.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.95 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 73 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.80 +++++ +	IN EN IS ES	<i>n</i> = 330 <i>n</i> = 306 <i>n</i> = 309 <i>n</i> = 219	(28.4%) (26.3%) (26.5%) (18.8%)	<i>I</i> = 0.80** <i>I</i> = 1.00 <i>I</i> = 1.24* <i>I</i> = 1.11				
	++++	++++		ET EF IF IT	<i>n</i> = 196 <i>n</i> = 329 <i>n</i> = 361 <i>n</i> = 278	(16.8%) (28.3%) (31.0%) (23.9%)	<i>I</i> = 0.93 <i>I</i> = 1.13 <i>I</i> = 1.09 <i>I</i> = 0.84*				
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	148	12.7	0.88	I-TP	36	3.1	0.41***	Dt.T	184	15.8	0.72***
E-FJ	209	18.0	1.12	I-FP	85	7.3	0.63**	Dt.F	294	25.3	0.92
ES-P	36	3.1	0.88	IS-J	270	23.2	1.31**	Dt.S	306	26.3	1.24*
EN-P	132	11.3	1.22	IN-J	248	21.3	1.06	Dt.N	380	32.6	1.11

Note: *N* = 1,164 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 2

Psychological type profile for clergywomen in 2013 compared with profiles from Francis et al (2007)

The Sixteen Complete Types								Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 26 (8.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.82 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 58 (18.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.54* +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 32 (10.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 33 (10..7%) <i>I</i> = 1.59 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 124 (40.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	I <i>n</i> = 183 (59.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.10	S <i>n</i> = 135 (44.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.24*	N <i>n</i> = 172 (56.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.87*				
	+++++	+++++	+++++								
	+++++	+++++	+	T <i>n</i> = 113 (36.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.41**	F <i>n</i> = 194 (63.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.86**						
	+++++			J <i>n</i> = 235 (76.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.19**	P <i>n</i> = 72 (23.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.66**						
ISTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.19* +	INFP <i>n</i> = 21 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.49** +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 9 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.74 +++	Pairs and Temperaments							
		++		IJ <i>n</i> = 149 (48.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.42***							
				IP <i>n</i> = 34 (11.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.56**							
				EP <i>n</i> = 38 (12.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.79							
				EJ <i>n</i> = 86 (28.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.92							
				ST <i>n</i> = 43 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.23							
				SF <i>n</i> = 92 (30.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.25							
				NF <i>n</i> = 102 (33.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.67***							
				NT <i>n</i> = 70 (22.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.54*							
ESTP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.3%) <i>I</i> = 3.09 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.96 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 21 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.65 +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 8 (2.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 +++	SJ <i>n</i> = 122 (39.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.36**							
		++		SP <i>n</i> = 13 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.67							
				NP <i>n</i> = 59 (19.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.66**							
				NJ <i>n</i> = 113 (36.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.04							
				TJ <i>n</i> = 90 (29.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.45*							
				TP <i>n</i> = 23 (7.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.27							
				FP <i>n</i> = 49 (16.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.54***							
				FJ <i>n</i> = 145 (47.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.07							
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 11 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.65 ++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 27 (8.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.30 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 28 (9.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.62* +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 20 (6.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.93 +++++	IN <i>n</i> = 95 (30.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.94	EN <i>n</i> = 77 (25.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.79	IS <i>n</i> = 88 (28.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.36*	ES <i>n</i> = 47 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.07				
	+++++	+++++	++	ET <i>n</i> = 43 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	EF <i>n</i> = 81 (26.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.78	IF <i>n</i> = 113 (36.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	IT <i>n</i> = 70 (22.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.64**				
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	31	10.1	1.14	I-TP	11	3.6	1.42	Dt.T	42	13.7	1.20
E-FJ	55	17.9	0.83	I-FP	23	7.5	0.43***	Dt.F	78	25.4	0.65**
ES-P	9	2.9	1.39	IS-J	84	27.4	1.62**	Dt.S	93	30.3	1.60**
EN-P	29	9.4	0.70	IN-J	65	21.2	1.22	Dt.N	94	30.6	0.99

Note: *N* = 307 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3

Summary psychological type profile data

	Male			Female		
	Norms	2007	2013	Norms	2007	2013
<i>Preferences</i>						
Extraversion	46.9	43.1	45.1	57.3	46.0	40.4
Introversion	53.1	56.9	54.9	42.7	54.0	59.6
Sensing	73.1	38.3	45.4	79.3	35.4	44.0
Intuition	26.9	61.7	54.6	20.7	64.6	56.0
Thinking	64.8	46.5	40.7	29.6	26.2	36.8
Feeling	35.2	53.5	59.3	70.4	73.8	63.2
Judging	54.7	68.2	75.2	61.5	64.6	76.5
Perceiving	45.3	31.8	24.8	38.5	35.4	23.5
<i>Temperaments</i>						
SJ	44.3	31.2	38.9	54.2	29.1	39.7
SP	28.9	7.2	6.4	25.1	6.3	4.2
NT	14.5	26.7	22.3	5.3	14.8	22.8
NF	12.3	35.0	32.3	15.4	49.8	33.2

Note: For the 2007 study see Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The full 2013 data are published for the first time in the present study.